Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)
Meeting Minutes
(Approved by Council December 17, 2003)

August 20, 2003
8:40 a.m. to 1:15 p.m., East Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building
700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho

The August 20, 2003, meeting of the Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) was held in the East Conference Room of the Joe R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho.

CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME
Pam Ahrens, Council Chairman, who welcomed members and guests present, called the meeting to order.

ATTENDANCE

Members/Designates Present:
Pam Ahrens, Department of Administration
Senator Hal Bunderson, Idaho State Senate
Col. Dan Charboneau, Idaho State Police
David Ekern, Idaho Transportation Department
Dr. Marilyn Howard, Department of Education
Keith Johnson, Office of the State Controller
Karl Kurtz, Department of Health and Welfare
Rep. David Langhorst, Idaho House of Reps
Roger Parks, JR Simplot Company
Gary Stivers, State Board of Education
Steve Wilson, State Tax Commission
*Major Dave Rich, Idaho State Police

*Designate

Absent Members:
Rep. Lee Gagner, Idaho House of Representatives
Ken Harward, Association of Idaho Cities
Mary Elizabeth Jones, Filer, Idaho
John Peay, Idaho Supreme Court
Senator Elliot Werk, Idaho State Senate

Others Present:
Maria Barratt, Division of Financial Management
Nathan Bentley, ITRMC Staff
Bryan Carter, Idaho
Carla Casper, Department of Administration
John Cline, Bureau of Disaster Services
Jan Cox, Department of Administration
Dena Duncan, Department of Administration
Jon Eckerle, Department of Administration
Rich Elwood, ITRMC Staff
Bill Farnsworth, ITRMC Staff
Don Fournier, ITRMC Staff

Emily Gales, ITRMC Staff
Bob Hunter, Intermountain Technology Group
Kevin Iwersen, Department of Administration
Mike Key, Idaho State Police
Kathy Pennisi, Wildcard Database Programming
Margaret Ross, Public Health District IV
Susan Simmons, Idaho Transportation Department
Dan Tennant, Verizon – ESG
Jeff Watson, Wildcard Database Programming
Charles Wright, Department of Health and Welfare

INTRODUCTION OF DAVID EKERN
Chairman Ahrens welcomed new Council member **David Ekern**, who was recently appointed Director of the Idaho Transportation Department. All members and designees present then introduced themselves. Ahrens mentioned that member **Roger Parks had received national recognition** as one of the top chief information officers (CIO's) in the country. She was very pleased with Parks' active ITRMC participation and support.

MOTION: Senator Hal Bunderson moved and Representative David Langhorst seconded a motion to approve the June 23, 2003, ITRMC Meeting Minutes, and the motion passed unanimously.

BUREAU OF DISASTER SERVICES

(Refer to presentations: http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/eoc.pdf and http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/wtc.pdf)

John Cline addressed the Council, speaking on the **State of Idaho Emergency Operations Center (EOC)**. In order to help those present grasp the significance of what the EOC was all about, he also presented an overview of the **emergency response to the 2001 World Trade Center (WTC) attack**.

Discussion Items:
– Effective communications. At the State level, said Cline, Idaho was doing great when it came to effective communication. However, the emergency communications technology to facilitate maintaining continuity and ongoing operations with local government was not present. **Cooperation, communications, and coordination** were of the most importance in resolving these issues. Cline mentioned the existence of the State Disaster Preparedness Act (Idaho Code, Title 46, Chapter 10). Evidently, Major General John Kane, Adjutant General, Division of the Military, might perhaps pursue changes in legislation during the upcoming legislative session.
   o Per **Major Dave Rich**, Idaho State Police, the Bureau of Disaster Services (BDS) was the focal point by which Idaho State and local government agencies were involved in emergency efforts. There were continuing efforts to try to accommodate cooperation, communication, and coordination (the "three C's"), but there was continual need for improvement. Egos would always be a challenge, he said.
   o Chairman Ahrens reiterated that State agencies were working closely together. However, local government interaction with the State needed to be boosted.
– State/local coordination. **Dr. Marilyn Howard**, Department of Education, commented that there needed to be an integrated first-response effort in Idaho's small local communities. She wondered who's responsibility it was to coordinate this. Cooperation did not indicate that there would be a central vision or mandates for the agencies involved, she said. According to Cline, the State used the **Incident Command System (ICS)**, a management tool providing a structure for response to emergency situations. Idaho was one of the few states where most first-responder agencies had adopted ICS in unified command. Said Cline, the ICS was a great system, but it was not always abided by due to egos involved. He advised the ICS would be changed over the next two to five years to conform to the new National Interagency Incident Management System.
   o In answer to a follow-up question from Dr. Howard, Cline advised information was transmitted from State to local agencies through the BDS. The BDS' first point of contact for counties was emergency managers. Idaho's cities were not required by the Legislature to have an emergency management program. Consequently, the county emergency managers worked with cities in this process.
– NIFC benefits. The State enjoyed some technical benefits of the National Interagency Fire Center (NIFC), which was located less than five miles from the BDS.
– Leveraging lessons learned. David Ekern mentioned he had spent the last two-and-a-half years in Washington, D.C., working with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) dealing with how to integrate transportation into the lessons learned from the 2001 attack on the WTC. About $2.5 million was spent in nationwide studies; Ekern mentioned some key things learned. The secret to achieving the "three C's" was using lessons learned to drive the way organizations naturally did business. Another note taken from the studies was that the use of co-location and co-use of equipment could solve the problem of having to request donated equipment. This resulted in a multiple payoff for a single investment, Ekern said.
– Status of the E911 Systems Subcommittee of the ITRMC Public Safety, Emergency Communications Committee. **Don Fournier**, ITRMC Staff, advised that during the 2002-2003

legislative session, Ada County Sheriff Vaughn Killeen (Chair of the E911 Systems Subcommittee) submitted public safety legislation that would allow for enhanced funding for E911 services. That legislation, which amended the Emergency Communications Act (http://www3.state.id.us/idstat/TOC/31048KTOC.html), was successful. Since the legislation was passed, the group would need to re-examine its focus.

– Requests to Legislature. Dr. Howard asked if members of the State Legislature were receiving information and/or requests that would indicate the need for equipment to make the larger system operate. In addition, she wondered if agency budgets would allow for the recognition of interconnectivity of the requests and how. **Representative David Langhorst**, Idaho House, advised he did not see any comprehensive view on disaster or emergency services in the form of legislation during the 2002-2003 session. There was, however, the recent formation of the **State Interoperability Executive Committee (SIEC)**, which would be handling a lot of coordination between agencies.

   o Funding was constrained, but a matter of prioritization, said **Senator Hal Bunderson**, Idaho State Senate. Clearly, legislators had a sense that the establishment of interoperable communications was the direction the State must go. He wondered what needed to happen, in Cline's view. To Bunderson, it sounded like the "three C's" were starting to come together, but the State had a long ways to go. Cline agreed. The State had been cooperatively involved in the effort since the 1995 bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City.

– BDS funding needs known? Dr. Howard wanted to know, from Cline's point of view, if he had done a good job of communicating the Bureau of Disaster Services' funding needs to the Legislature. Honestly, Cline advised that most legislative members did not even know that the BDS existed due to the agency's small size, the level of its visibility, and bureaucracy. He had done the best he could; but, no, he had not done a *good* job.

Additional Notes:

– There was no EOC prior to 1995. No State funding had been contributed to the Center. The fourth-generation computers housed there were donated by other State agencies.
– Chairman Ahrens mentioned that many State employees were volunteering their time and expertise to the EOC. It had been a shared effort with very little cost to the State.
– Per Representative Langhorst, because of the creation of the SIEC, Idaho was eligible to apply for federal Department of Homeland Security grants.
– If the Legislature were forwarded a vision of what was needed, there would be ample support to pass whatever was necessary to move forward, added Senator Bunderson.

INTEROPERABILITY

Per Major Rich, the Public Safety Statewide Trunked Radio System Subcommittee of the ITRMC Public Safety, Emergency Communication Committee would most likely dissolve because of the creation of the **Statewide Interoperability Executive Council (SIEC)** by executive order of the Governor (EO 2003-07, http://www2.state.id.us/gov/mediacenter/execorders/eo03/eo_2003_07.htm). Based on this executive order, the Governor's Office was compiling a list of appropriate individuals to serve on the SIEC. It was hoped the newly formed group would meet sometime in October 2003 to begin to work towards interoperable radio communications.

WORK GROUP / COMMITTEE UPDATE

Idaho Criminal Justice Information Integration Task Force

Major Rich continued. The ITRMC Staff, on behalf of the Task Force, applied for Byrne grant program funding. The appropriation, which would have financed the compilation of a comprehensive strategic plan for statewide justice integration, was not awarded. (Byrne grant funds were provided through the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice.) Major Rich went on to explain the benefits of integrating justice information gathered by all entities in this arena. He then mentioned the National Governors' Association (NGA) had recently recognized the need, on a national level, to move

forward with justice integration. Accordingly, the NGA covered travel expenses for a team of State representatives to attend its Center for Best Practices' **Justice Information Sharing Workshop** held in Salt Lake City (SLC), Utah (September 29-30). The Task Force was excited about the opportunity to participate.

At the last meeting of the Idaho Criminal Justice Information Integration Task Force, ITRMC member John Peay of the Idaho Supreme Court volunteered to draft a downsized strategic plan identifying issues to be resolved in Idaho with regard to justice integration, said Major Rich. This draft was expected to be complete prior to the SLC trip.

Discussion:
Major Rich answered a question from Dr. Marilyn Howard. When the integrated justice system was complete, he said, the criminal justice community would be able to access in one place all existing information on a person that had been entered by entities in the criminal justice community. Possibilities could be expanded upon in the future. Further, it was possible to make juvenile offender information accessible, as well. (**Colonel Dan Charboneau**, Idaho State Police, later mentioned that not all juvenile offenders' information would be made available in the system.) Major Rich went on to briefly describe other benefits to integrating criminal justice information.

INTRODUCTION OF ITRMC STAFF
Rich Elwood, Statewide Information Technology Coordinator and ITRMC Staff, introduced the other members of the Staff. **Bill Farnsworth**, IT Policy Analyst, specialized in Internet-related issues. **Don Fournier**, IT Policy Analyst, had expertise in wide area network, telecommunications, and security/cyber security. **Nathan Bentley** was the State Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Coordinator. **Emily Gales** was the Staff assistant.

ITRMC IT POLICIES, ENTERPRISE STANDARDS & GUIDELINES
Per Bill Farnsworth, most standard revisions had surfaced because of working with State agency IT managers.

Review and Approve

Policy 5020, Guideline G410
The '.gov' domain was only for use by federal agencies until March 2003, said Farnsworth, when it was made available for use by other government entities. Since that time twenty-six states had adopted and were actively promoting '.gov' domain names.

Using the '.gov' domain would simplify the State's domain structure. Per Farnsworth, the biggest advantage was that it was restricted and could only be used by governmental entities. This would prevent agencies from having to buy multiple domain names that might resemble government website addresses.

Farnsworth had met with many State agencies regarding the draft policy and guideline; a great deal of useful feedback was received. He thanked Council member **Steve Wilson**, State Tax Commission, for communicating with IT managers. In addition, **Jon Eckerle**, Department of Administration, was instrumental in the development of the documents, and had been working with State agency webmasters.

Chairman Ahrens pointed out that, if Policy 5020 were adopted, agencies would not have to immediately make changes to printed materials such as business cards and letterhead. The current 'state.id.us' website addresses would be redirected to the new domain, and would not be eliminated

until the respective agency desired. Agency compliance was required a maximum of three years from the date the policy was adopted by the ITRMC.

Discussion Items:
– State agency reactions. Per Wilson, opinions of the technical community ranged from opposition, to ambivalence, to enthusiasm; most business-oriented people he had spoken to were enthusiastic about the idea. The primary concern expressed by IT folks related to the method by which an agency could be granted an exception to the policy. Further, a simple, one-time process for doing so was desired.
– Domain name approval process. Wilson wondered what the Access Idaho Steering Committee might use to make decisions on domain name approvals. Said Farnsworth, agencies would, for the most part, be allowed to use requested domain names. The main reason for assigning a body to review and approve the names was because in some cases, multiple agencies had requested the same domain names. He explained further, and mentioned that Guideline G410 should address most agency concerns.

Jon Eckerle addressed the Council. He was the **State domain name server/service (DNS) manager**, and therefore would do most of the work on DNS resolutions for all domain names under the 'idaho.gov' structure. He went on to explain more of his duties, as well as logistics, pertaining to the '.gov' domain. He also reiterated that the 'state.id.us' domain would be maintained indefinitely.

Other Discussion Items:
– Approval process. Agencies were to submit uniform resource locator (URL), or website address, requests to the Access Idaho Steering Committee for approval.
– Unauthorized use of an organization's name in a URL. Anyone could reserve any unregistered URL. The State Office of the Attorney General had been asked to look into the use of several website addresses that appeared to identify State agency sites, but in fact did not; there was at that time no outcome to this query. Again, the *'.gov' domain* was registered to government entities only.
– **State agency cost of implementation**. Eckerle would perform most work, though some agency personnel resources would need to be dedicated to the changeover. Per Wilson, for the State Tax Commission, there would not be a great deal of cost from a business standpoint. His technical staff was not extremely concerned about the time and effort that would be required of them.
– Cost savings. With the elimination of non-'.gov' domain name registrations, the State could annually save approximately $2,000 to $3,000. Local government agencies could cumulatively save around $10,000 in URL registration and DNS hosting costs.
– Guideline G410, page three, third paragraph under *Naming Conventions, Requirements*: "*Cities, counties and/or school districts may not use…*" This portion was included for informational purposes, and was part of federal rules pertaining to the use of the '.gov' domain.
– '.gov' domain management. The U.S. Department of Commerce had contracted with a third-party vendor to manage the domain.
– Handling of non-'state.id.us' domain names (i.e. '.org,' '.com'). If Policy 5010 were approved, all existing State agency URL's would resolve to the 'idaho.gov' domain structure. As with all ITRMC policies and standards, agencies may apply for an exemption as outlined in Policy 1010.

MOTION: Representative David Langhorst moved and Karl Kurtz seconded a motion to adopt ITRMC IT Policy 5010, .Gov Domain, and IT Enterprise Guideline G410, Idaho.gov, Id.gov Domains, and the motion passed unanimously.

Standards 2100, 2110, 2120, and 2510
Farnsworth continued. **Standard 2100, Operating System**, was updated pursuant to agency feedback.

Standard 2110, Office Suite, was updated for clarification and to include more information pertaining to emerging trends and architectural directions. In answer to a question from Wilson, Farnsworth

advised not a great deal of agency feedback had been received regarding the use of Microsoft .NET, a set of software technologies for connecting information, people, systems, and devices.
_____

Microsoft Outlook 98 was removed as an approved standard in **Standard 2120, Electronic Mail – Messaging**, as the product would soon enter the Non-Supported phase. Additional language was included in the 'Emerging Trends' section.
_____

Updates were made to **Standard 2510, Network Operating System**, to allow more flexibility. Windows Server 2003 was added, as well as many changes to the 'Technical and Implementation Considerations' and 'Emerging Trends' sections. Agency feedback prompted revisions to this standard. Answering a question from Col. Dan Charboneau, the ITRMC Staff did not receive much agency comment on reactions to using and/or experimenting with Linux, said Farnsworth. Charboneau asked that the Idaho State Police be a test bed for the program, if possible.

Discussion Items:
– Rich Elwood discussed major lawsuits in process involving Linux. He warned that State agencies should consider the potential liability of using the program.
– Linux as a solution. Steve Wilson advised most agency issues with Standard 2510 pertained to Linux. From a technical standpoint, some State IT managers, including Wilson, believed Linux could be a valuable part of an operation and could be used very constructively. However, he said, given the fact the Council made decisions based on technical *and* business issues, he agreed Linux should not be a State standard product at that time.
– Possible server consolidation strategy. Server consolidation had been considered on numerous occasions. In addition, an ITRMC work group had been formed to consider enterprise e-mail service for the State; though, it was recommended the State not move forward with an enterprise e-mail system at that time. There had also been talk of consolidating web servers in the past. The ITRMC Staff would continue to promote server consolidation, especially for small State agencies with limited or no IT staff.

MOTION: Karl Kurtz moved and Roger Parks seconded a motion to approve revisions to ITRMC IT Enterprise Standards 2100, Operating System; 2110, Office Suite; 2120, Electronic Mail – Messaging; and 2510, Network Operating System, and the motion passed unanimously.

Standards 3100 and 3110
Some security-related language was added to **Standard 3100, Network Services – Internet/Intranet Web Server**. Additional 'Emerging Trends' information was also included.
_____

A service pack was released for an approved product, and was consequently added to **Standard 3110, Network Services – Internet/Intranet Web Browser**. Again, additional 'Emerging Trends' information was also included.

Standards 3220 and 3530
Don Fournier advised of minor changes that had been made to **Standard 3220, Security – Virtual Private Network** (VPN). A key virtual private network protocol was added to the 'Approved Standard(s)' list. Under 'Justification,' the second sentence was changed to read: "*The VPN-1 product suite is compatible with enterprise* security *services and significant…*" rather than "*The VPN-1 product…enterprise* firewall *services…*" Fournier further explained why this change was made.

Discussion Items:
– Concerns from the IT community. Per Wilson, there was certainly some concern within the State's IT community in terms of approving specific products. There was a consensus that approving standards (i.e. those listed in Policy 3220), along with products that conform to those standards, might give agencies a bit more latitude. He wondered about the process of naming a specific product as the only VPN standard product. The Staff's general direction was normally to refer to an

established industry standard. In the security arena, there were unfortunately at that time no defined standards for intrusion detection devices, VPNs, or firewalls that ensured complete interoperability and functionality between devices. An industry standard for these kinds of devices would likely be considered for ITRMC adoption when available.

– Use of a non-standard product. On behalf of the ISP, Major Dave Rich expressed concern that Policy 3220 only identified a software solution. According to Major Rich, Cisco Systems, Inc. had some very good VPN security products, which were compatible with a lot of ISP hardware. Fournier responded. If a solution was infrastructure-based, it was not in conflict with ITRMC standards. However, there could potentially be a conflict if a device was performing VPN client services through a device(s) in the enterprise security structure.

Extensive IT manager input was received regarding **Standard 3530, Network Connectivity and Transport – Wireless Local Area Network (LAN)**. Its primary change was the addition of a new approved standard that enabled the use of a higher-capacity bandwidth technology completely compatible and interoperable with the existing approved ITRMC standard and industry infrastructure. Other suggestions that were incorporated dealt with providing additional guidance under the 'Emerging Trends' and 'Technical Considerations' sections.

MOTION: Representative David Langhorst moved and Karl Kurtz seconded a motion to approve revisions to ITRMC IT Enterprise Standards 3100, Network Services – Internet/Intranet Web Server; 3110, Network Services – Internet/Intranet Web Browser; 3220, Security – Virtual Private Network and 3530, Network Connectivity and Transport – Wireless LAN, and the motion passed unanimously.

Rescind

Policy 4010 and Standard 3210
Policy 4010, Digital Certificates & Public Key Infrastructure, was being suggested for rescinding as it referred to a very specific technology solution that had been considered by the ITRMC Secure Access to Applications and Data (SATAD) Work Group. The group's conclusion was that putting the infrastructure in place was not cost effective for the State as an authentication solution. Therefore, there was no need for the policy.

Wilson thought digital certificates could and should have a place in how the State handled security of information. He was concerned that, to some extent, the project had gotten away from those involved, and wondered if cost-effective implementation of a public key infrastructure was still a possibility for the State. Fournier shared Wilson's concerns, and advised the SATAD Work Group would remain active and continue to champion the issue. When available, the appropriate technology and/or the appropriateness of digital certificates would be recommended by the group.

Standard 3210, Security – Network Intrusion Detection System, was being recommended for rescinding for three major reasons. A change in and evolution of the technology itself was taking place, and notable industry firms were discouraging organizations from investing additional funds in the technology. State security professionals also had similar observations and recommendations. Secondly, existing products that were part of the State's security infrastructure were capable of implementing intrusion detection. Lastly, the approved product was not considered an optimal long-term solution for this type of technology. There were concerns over: the financial condition of the company; the current market share of the product; and the direction of the product in the marketplace.

The ITRMC Staff and others had concern about rescinding Standard 3210 without having something else in place that could be used. As the architectural direction of the security infrastructure evolved, the Staff would come forth with it for approval.

MOTION: Steve Wilson moved and Roger Parks seconded a motion to rescind ITRMC IT Policy 4010, Digital Certificates & Public Key Infrastructure, and IT Enterprise Standard 3210, Security – Network Intrusion Detection System; and that the ITRMC Secure Access to Applications and Data (SATAD) Work Group continue to consider the issue of digital certificates and public key infrastructure, at some point bringing forth an additional recommendation for ITRMC approval, and the motion did not pass, as there was not a quorum present because some voting members left the meeting prior to adjournment.

MOTION: Representative David Langhorst moved to approve with no revisions ITRMC IT Enterprise Standards 3120, 3130, 3200, 3510, 3520, 3540, 3550, 5110, and 5120, and the motion did not pass, as there was not a quorum present because some voting members left the meeting prior to adjournment.

ITRMC STAFF

Nathan Bentley addressed the Council. The drafting of the **Idaho Geospatial Data Implementation Plan (I-Plan)** was inspired by the federal Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) I-Team initiative. The Plan identified how to obtain the spatial data required to be able to use geographic information systems (GIS) at the framework data level. Bentley continued with an overview of how the I-Plan was composed. The Plan's vision statement was based on a *cooperative strategy* related to geospatial framework data.

To create the seven essential thematic data layers mentioned in the Idaho I-Plan, it would cost approximately seven million dollars, said Bentley. The Plan itself helped to identify where those funds would originate. Bentley then explained why it was important to have an I-Plan, which was available online at http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/igc.htm#I-Plan.

Discussion Items:
– 'Hole' in Idaho's digital parcel data. A process for collecting and handling important, additional data from a handful of Idaho's local governments had been identified in order to fill in areas with no digital land ownership data.
– Future preparedness. Bentley explained that as more Idaho counties participated with INSIDE (Interactive Numeric & Spatial Data Engine) Idaho, official statewide geospatial data clearinghouse, the State would be prepared to address future data needs issues.

WORK GROUP / COMMITTEE UPDATE (continued)

Access Idaho Steering Committee

Bill Farnsworth, Steering Committee Chairman, reviewed Access Idaho's General Manager's Report highlights for July 2003 (see: http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/committees/accessidaho/july03gmreport.pdf). He then reviewed some statistics pertaining to the use of some applications built by Access Idaho:
– Eighty-nine citizens had renewed their vehicle registrations online within the first week of the launch of Ada County's online renewal application.
– Since the launch of the Idaho Real Estate Commission's (IREC) agent license renewal application, fifty percent of Idaho insurance agents had renewed their licenses online. In addition, the IREC application had received local and, especially, national press attention.
– Eleven percent of registered nursing license renewals had taken place online since the time Access Idaho built the Board of Nursing online application to do so.

Webmasters Committee

Farnsworth continued. The Webmasters Committee had been a very active group.

Additional Notes:
- – Training on accessible web design, co-hosted by the ITRMC and Northwest ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990) and IT Center (Portland, Oregon), was held in July. Over seventy-five agency webmasters, public information officers, and IT professionals attended the day-long session. Farnsworth noted Jon Eckerle and Cheryl Flood of the Department of Administration had been instrumental in organizing the training.
- – Due to State budget constraints, multiple agency webmasters had volunteered to teach internal training classes.

IDANET Steering Committee

Said Chairman Ahrens, the IDANET Steering Committee was created at the ITRMC's June 23, 2003, meeting (see: http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030623.htm#idanet). **Susan Simmons**, Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), was elected chair of the group.

Simmons provided an update on Committee activities:
- – The IDANET Steering Committee had met twice.
- – Two standing subcommittees dealing with the financial and technical aspects of IDANET were formed. David Tolman of the ITD chaired the Financial Subcommittee; Bob Hough, Department of Labor, led the Technical Subcommittee. Simmons mentioned the Department of Labor had been very active in and had contributed a great deal of personnel resources to the IDANET initiative since its inception.
- – The ITRMC Staff had developed a Steering Committee newsletter, Ida*net* News.
- – The Department of Labor had agreed to provide up-front funding for the five switches needed for the IDANET backbone (high-speed, high-capacity communications network connecting major population centers in Idaho).
- – Lucent Technologies equipment originally installed was at that time being replaced with equipment from Cisco Systems, Inc. due to some problems encountered. As of August 19, no major issues had been reported.
- – Two switches were on order for the Meridian/Lewiston connection. It was anticipated the new switches would be installed by September 1. This step would complete the redundant loop sought after for so long.
- – Master services agreement negotiations were ongoing with Electric Lightwave, Inc., Qwest, and Syringa Networks for IDANET network management Regions 3, 4, and 5.
- – Next, a plan for completing the main backbone would be developed.
- – Simmons mentioned an **education representative** was welcome to join the Committee, if they so desired.
  - o **Karl Kurtz**, Department of Health and Welfare, stressed the importance of major statewide entities, including the public education community, to be involved with the IDANET initiative. Chairman Ahrens reported she had appeared before the State Board of Education regarding IDANET, which was originally designed with the idea that education would participate. She mentioned the issue would be introduced to the Legislature, as well.
- – Ahrens reviewed IDANET progress over the past two months. The next step was a report to the Division of Financial Management, and the start of a marketing process. She then reported a great success on a statewide, shared radio communications system upgrade.

Enterprise IT Security and Business Recovery Work Group

Karl Kurtz provided an update on Work Group activities, and presented recommendations (refer to handout: http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/itsecurity.pdf). The group was having difficulty identifying needs on a statewide level, Kurtz said.

Discussion Items:
- – Mission-critical applications. One challenge for the group would be to determine which mission-critical applications needed disaster recovery. Kurtz discussed this further.

–   Kudos. Per Steve Wilson, there was a great deal of interest in the issue of IT security and business recovery among State IT managers. He was very glad to see it moving forward. Per **Keith Johnson**, State Controller, the group's recommendations were consistent with longtime efforts by the State Controller's Office. Col. Charboneau commended Kurtz for his work on the matter.

IT STRATEGIC PLAN / IT STRATEGY SUMMIT

(Refer to handouts: http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/goals&strategies.pdf, http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/pre-work_comments.pdf and http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/strategy_process.pdf)

Rich Elwood addressed the Council, reviewing historical attempts in Idaho to address the issue of how to manage technology and telecommunications effectively and efficiently and deliver services to both citizens and businesses. He asked those present to consider the technology available in 1992 during the Telecomm '92 effort versus what was available today. Following Telecomm '92, the next significant effort was by the InfoTech '96 Task Force, which resulted in the formation of the ITRMC. In preparation of the October 14 "IT Strategy Summit," the ITRMC Staff had reviewed the *Telecomm '92* report and the *InfoTech '96 Task Force Report*, looking for things that had and had not been accomplished to-date. The Staff had also reviewed other state IT plans, and Elwood briefly discussed some of them.

In 2001, the ITRMC adopted a revised *State IT Plan*. This plan was purposefully written very broadly and was designed to be a guiding direction in vision with five opportunities and some guiding principles identified. Appendices to the document were the ITRMC IT policies and enterprise standards and guidelines.

Per Elwood, **the State of Idaho was at a crossroads** regarding how to build on and move forward with its successes, and address its challenges. He questioned if the State was ready to take an enterprise view of common issues across agencies. There was at this point a challenge and opportunity for the Council to assess where the State would go.

The Council would undergo a three-phase approach to developing a new State information technology plan. Today's meeting discussion would serve as the first phase, focusing on IT strategy scope and content definition.

Roger Parks briefly described background information on **Terry Lester**, JR Simplot Company, who would facilitate much of the October 14 "IT Strategy Summit" discussion. Parks was encouraged that Lester would bring value to the process.

Today's goal was refined identification of information technology goals and strategies for the State. From this input, a new goals and strategies document would be drafted and sent to other invitees of the "Strategy Summit" for input. (Other invitees included about twenty-five select: Idaho State elected officials, legislative staff members, members of the Governor's staff, State agency directors and IT managers, members of the State's education community, local government representatives, and private industry leaders.) The objective of the second phase, the "ITRMC IT Strategy Summit," would be to use input received from Summit attendees prior to the event.

A portion of the morning session on October 14 would be dedicated to learning private sector representative perspectives during a panel discussion entitled "Managing IT to Maximize Investment." In the afternoon, ITRMC members would decide what goals and strategies were important for the State to follow. The ITRMC Staff would then prioritize that direction and draft an updated State strategic IT plan for Council review and approval.

Elwood went on to explain that the ITRMC Staff had sent to Council members prior to today's meeting for input, a document that consolidated the *State IT Plan* adopted in 2001, and key elements of the

InfoTech '96 Task Force Report and the *ITRMC Discussion Topics* document distributed at the June 23, 2003, Council meeting. Using this document, members were asked to evaluate/prioritize each goal strategy. New goals and strategies would possibly be drafted based on Council input received.

Elwood then initiated discussion on the goals and strategies developed by the ITRMC Staff.

Discussion Items:
- Goal I, Strategy 8. Col. Dan Charboneau thought this strategy was somewhat limiting. He said we should look broader – to the private sector.
- Goal I. Implement 'One Government.'
  o Kurtz noted that Idaho government was coming together more and more on the state level. However, there was not much participation from the local governments (cities and counties). He suggested a strategy be added as to how to get Idaho's local governments involved in the process of achieving 'one government.' Elwood mentioned there had been some efforts toward engaging local governments. Examples were present in the GIS community and with the recent ".gov" initiative.
  o Said Representative Langhorst, if the State had a single access point for citizens (one phone number from which calls could be routed, for example), Goal I. could be re-worded to reflect this. Per Elwood, when this goal was written, the intention was that electronic government services should be oriented towards the services offered, not from where the services originated.
  o David Ekern agreed with the idea of a common face to government. He was concerned that some strategies were varied in other goals, and thought the message of the Council's commitment to implementing a common face of government for its customers should be clearly sent. In addition, this "common face" should include all levels of government. Per Ekern, identifying this focus would set the stage for cooperation among the different levels of government.

    Ekern discussed the fact that, depending on the situation i.e. an emergency, citizens' interaction with government was not always the same. This, he said, should be a significantly different kind of goal in terms of how the State used technology. In addition, agencies' internal, transparent improvements were of less value to citizens.
  o Chairman Ahrens pointed out that this discussion was essentially touching on value-added government, as citizens were not aware of many services being offered to them. In addition, the money that supported all three levels of government (local, state, federal) was derived from the same source. Agencies, though, were all very proprietary about funds and resources individually received.
- Server consolidation. Elwood advised forty-seven e-mail servers and over one hundred Internet-facing servers had been identified in the State. Citizens expected government to use tax dollars to provide necessary services when needed, at the lowest possible cost, he said. Our challenge as government workers was to make this happen.
  o Per Parks, work being performed by the ITRMC Enterprise IT Security and Business Recovery Work Group afforded an opportunity to consider how the State would handle server consolidation. For instance, depending on the number of mission-critical servers in the State, would an investment in an equal number of those for redundancy be wise? Other issues could also be considered for possible cost-savings and higher service levels.
  o Keith Johnson regarded cooperative consolidation as a serious issue to be addressed. From his perspective, duplication should be performed quite frequently.
- Action plan development. Wilson wondered if an action plan would be included in the State's updated IT plan. He wanted to know how the strategies would be carried out, and who would do so. Elwood advised the ITRMC Staff needed the Council's direction as to the answer to that question. Wilson stressed the need for the development of an action plan. Said Elwood, ideas from other good state and/or private industry and/or federal government examples could perhaps be utilized.

All the states, he said, basically had the same problems, and the same federal government and group of supervisors (citizens) to deal with.

- o Parks stated the Council needed to also consider a business case i.e. the value proposition for the investment being sought to implement particular goals and/or strategies. Elwood agreed, adding that statutory changes could be in order.
- – Plan revision process. There was more discussion by Elwood on the process the Council and Staff would undergo in the preparation of an updated State IT strategic plan. He noted that, from comments already received from Council members, it was evident that sharing among agencies was of common, high interest. Perhaps this aspect alone could be formulated as a goal. He continued with ideas for re-structuring the goals and strategies.
- – Plan organization. Wilson thought there was a fair amount of opportunity to consolidate some of the eight strategies listed under Goal I. He agreed that collaboration, cooperation, and communication – in essence, sharing – could be categorized as a separate goal, as none of the other goals and strategies would be achieved without those elements.
- – Collaboration efforts. Ekern was fascinated by the concept of involving collaborators outside of State government i.e. local government and the private sector, and wondered if there were mechanisms in place for them to assist in implementing State-defined goals and strategies. This was a valid question, said Elwood. If these kinds of partnerships were desired, the State IT strategic plan should incorporate a means to facilitate them. Chairman Ahrens noted there was no statutory requirement to form these partnerships. As such, it was sometimes a challenge to engage local governments in decision-making processes. Col. Charboneau recommended the State approach the local governments with questions regarding what they saw as valuable services. Along those lines, Elwood wondered how to bring in State government entities not covered statutorily by the Council i.e. the legislative branch and elected officials.
  - o Senator Bunderson advised the last sentence on page one of the "ITRMC IT Strategy Discussion Document," "*Working together, a partnership of government leaders, citizens, and the private sector…*" needed emphasis. The issue of improving technology for government needed to be made available to the private sector on some basis to promote economic development in rural areas, for instance.
- – Goal II, Strategy 16. Col. Charboneau remarked that if emphasis were put on developing private partnerships, a lot of corporations would need to be solicited for input. This would be no easy task.
- – Council pre-work. Charboneau commented on the fact that only fifty percent of Council members had completed the pre-work forms intended to allow members to rank and comment on the information technology goals and strategies outlined in the "ITRMC IT Strategy Discussion Document" (http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/council/minutes/m030820/goals&strategies.pdf). In order for the rankings to be of value, the other members needed to be encouraged to fill out the forms.
  - o Elwood later asked those Council members who had not yet completed the pre-work forms to please do so. He asked all members to consider what kind of an IT plan was desired; the ITRMC Staff was very open to suggestions.
- – Plan format. David Ekern asked at what point the Council would consider and identify how and when the goals and strategies would actually be achieved. Per Rich Elwood, part of that decision was based on how detailed the Council wanted the strategies to be. Elwood's paradigm for a plan that included dates was that it was tactical. Nevertheless, the plan should be written in a format that would facilitate the ITRMC in accomplishing what was needed. Plan format was a decision for Council members to make. Wilson advised he did not have a problem with the plan being written at a high level, but an indication of how and when the goals and strategies would be accomplished, and who would do so, should be written. In short, more specificity needed to be developed. Parks agreed, and added that the goals and strategies should be identified before deciding how to execute and deliver them. Elwood briefly discussed some plan formats used by other states.
- – Business continuity. Wilson recommended language with respect to business continuity be included in the revised plan. Chairman Ahrens suggested this item might fit well under Goal III, rewording it to read "Provide *Reliable* Secure Access and Confidentiality."

- o On a related issue, Senator Bunderson advised he had received a constituent complaint that a State agency sold his or her personal information to an outside firm. However, this was more a legislative matter, said Bunderson.
- – Central coordination/local control. Chairman Ahrens briefly discussed the ITRMC management philosophy.
- – Goal V. Recruit and Retain a Proficient IT Workforce. Ekern suggested that rather than focus this goal as a workforce issue, to perhaps address a unique business model goal. As it then read, a total internal workforce and a reliance on government was implied as opposed to perhaps finding a model that utilized the private sector more aggressively. Chairman Ahrens mentioned this goal might have been added during the Y2K effort when the State was having a hard time retaining IT personnel.
- – Plan scope. Col. Charboneau expressed frustration with the large number of goals and strategies identified. He suggested a model with fewer items and an action plan. He reiterated the need for the development of a business resumption/disaster recovery plan.
- – State home page. Representative Langhorst suggested the improvement of marketing the existence of accessidaho.org, the State's official website. In addition, local governments should be encouraged to participate, which would result in reduction of costs and duplication. Regarding the goals and strategies document, he recommended some strategies be combined, as a number of them were stated more than once.
- – Change-management strategy development. Parks recommended the Council consider a change in management strategies, and suggested a change-management strategy be written to address and facilitate change across organizational boundaries.

Chairman Ahrens thanked the ITRMC Staff for organizing the meeting August 20. The Council had accomplished a great deal in a short period.

AGENDA ITEM SUGGESTION

Senator Bunderson introduced two representatives of the software development company Wildcard Database Programming. Per Bunderson, the two recently raised an issue that had been "fermenting" in Idaho for a few years: **vehicle fleet management programs**. He clarified, touching on Idaho's management of vehicle fleets. There were certain advantages to a statewide fleet management system, said Bunderson; and he suggested the topic be considered for a future ITRMC meeting agenda item. Parks commented there could be enormous opportunities for the State. Further, at the JR Simplot Company and others, when central consolidation of vehicle management systems was performed, there were substantial savings and improvements in the management of the systems themselves. There may be the same kinds of opportunities at the state level. Parks supported the investigation of the possible benefits of a centralized system.

The ITRMC Staff was tasked with investigating the matter further, performing an inventory of current agency systems.

NEW BUSINESS / ADJOURNMENT

As there was no other new business to come before the Council, Chairman Pam Ahrens thanked those in attendance and adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m. The invitation-only "ITRMC IT Strategy Summit" would be held on Tuesday, October 14 at the Hilton Garden Inn in Boise. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the ITRMC would be held on Wednesday, December 17 from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. in the East Conference Room of the Joe R. Williams Building.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Gales, ITRMC Assistant